

My view of broadcast ownership is that it should be limited in scope, so as to ensure that an oligopoly does not exist in the field of broadcasting - particularly with regards to how it could impact the field of news reporting. No other medium can be counted upon to form the nation's opinion like journalism can - particularly the ubiquitous form of broadcast journalism. Allowing consolidation to occur in this field, which would undoubtedly be the final result of such a decision, only succeeds in singular points of view to be expressed. Maintaining a strict limitation of ownership ensures democracy can be maintained by ensuring popular channels for competing views to be broadcast - instead of allowing an industry consolidation to hinder true reporting. Whereas news is SUPPOSED to be non-biased, it is a natural given that slants, either conservative or liberal, are tempered into the reporting. Supply of broadcasting channels is finite, and allowing the highest bidders to assume ownership of that finite resource results only in ensuring that some form of media slant (liberal or conservative, based on which can bid higher) becomes the loudest voice. This is not the way to ensure democracy.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

Dewite North